

May 3, 1993

LB 237, 239

CLERK: 29 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the advancement of LB 237.

SPEAKER BAACK: LB 237 advances. We'll now go to LB 239.

CLERK: 239, Mr. President, was a bill introduced by Senator Hillman, Baack and Wickersham. (Read title.) The bill was introduced on January 11, referred to the Education Committee for public hearing. The bill was advanced to General File. I do have committee amendments pending by the Education Committee.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Withem, on the committee amendments.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, very quickly. The committee amendments were meant to be technical provisions. Number one, current language makes reference to vocational technical education. The more up-to-date language is applied technology. Applied technology or occupational are terms that are used so the committee amendment strikes references to vocational technical and uses language applied technology. Secondly, the main function of LB 239 is to take the community college statutes that existed in the section of statutes where the elementary-secondary language occurred and move those over into the higher education statutes so that we'll have all higher education statutes together. Community colleges are, of course, part of the higher education system. The other change that is made is in reference to part of the community college statutes that inadvertently were not transferred when 239 was originally drafted. Those are the sections that deal with reduction in force policy. They were in Section 79 and the reference is here on the explanations 79-1254.05, 06, 07, 08. It moves those over into Chapter (sic) 85 along with the new language. I had a question asked by a member as to why the language was underlined, if it is old language. Well it is old language that did exist in another section, but will be new language into Section 85, so I believe that's the reason that the bill drafters have done that. It has been represented to me though as being absolutely no change from what was in preexisting language. I'm sure this whole reduction in force area has been relatively controversial as it relates to another bill that I had introduced and I would guess had there been any substantive changes in this language we would have heard about them, but it's my understanding that it is simply moving language from Section 79 into Section 85. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to respond.